1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

2122

23

24

_ _

25

26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

CASE NO. CR17-0269-JCC

Plaintiff,

v.

MINUTE ORDER

BRANDON BRANDRETH-GIBBS,

Defendant.

The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable John C. Coughenour, United States District Judge:

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' stipulated motion to continue trial and reset the pretrial motions deadline (Dkt. No. 30). Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the Court FINDS the following:

- (a) taking into account the exercise of due diligence, a failure to grant a continuance would deny counsel for the Defendant the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, due to the need for the parties to complete and present to the Court the necessary evaluations of Mr. Brandreth-Gibbs' competency to stand trial;
- (b) a failure to grant a continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i);
 - (c) the additional time requested is a reasonable period of delay, given the complexity

MINUTE ORDER CR17-0269-JCC PAGE - 1 of the case and the necessity of arriving at a fair determination of Mr. Brandreth-Gibbs' competency prior to completion of final trial preparation;

- (d) the case is sufficiently complex that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the current trial schedule, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii), given that the competency issue has not yet been resolved;
- (e) the ends of justice will best be served by a continuance, and the ends of justice outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendant in a speedier trial, as set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A); and
- (f) the additional time requested between the current trial date of February 12, 2018, and the new trial date is necessary to provide counsel for the Defendant reasonable time to prepare for trial considering all of the facts set forth above.
- (g) pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(1)(A), the time for trial is tolled during this period, from the date of the filing of the Defendant's Unopposed Motion for Competency Examination until the issue of Defendant's competency is determined by the Court.

Accordingly, the Court ORDERS that trial in this case be reset to July 16, 2018. Pretrial motions shall be filed no later than June 15, 2018. The Clerk is DIRECTED to VACATE the trial date currently scheduled for February 12, 2018.

DATED this 2nd day of February 2018.

William M. McCool Clerk of Court

s/Tomas Hernandez
Deputy Clerk